arXiv:1411.5629v2 [math.AC] 18 Oct 2015

RECURSIVE BETTI NUMBERS FOR COHEN-MACAULAY d-PARTITE CLUTTERS ARISING FROM POSETS

DAVIDE BOLOGNINI

Abstract. A natural extension of bipartite graphs are d-partite clutters, where $d \geq 2$ is an integer. For a poset P, Ene, Herzog and Mohammadi introduced the d-partite clutter $\mathcal{C}_{P,d}$ of multichains of length d in P, showing that it is Cohen-Macaulay. We prove that the cover ideal of $\mathcal{C}_{P,d}$ admits an x_i-splitting, determining a recursive formula for its Betti numbers and generalizing a result of Francisco, Hà and Van Tuyl on the cover ideal of Cohen-Macaulay bipartite graphs. Moreover we prove a Betti splitting result for the Alexander dual of a Cohen-Macaulay simplicial complex.

Keywords: resolution of edge ideals, Cohen-Macaulay clutters, Betti splittings, posets.
AMS Mathematics Subject Classification 2010: 13D02, 13A02, 05E40, 05E45.

1. Introduction

Edge ideals of graphs have been extensively studied by several authors (see for instance [9], [12], [16], [17], [33]). In recent years the interest focused on a generalization of the notion of graph, the so-called *clutter* (see [2], [27], [28], [15], [16], [35]).

Edge ideals have been introduced by Villarreal in [34]. Let $\Bbbk$ be a field and G a finite simple graph on n vertices. The edge ideal of G is

$$I(G) := (x_i x_j : \{i,j\} \text{ is an edge of } G) \subseteq S = \Bbbk[x_1, ..., x_n].$$

A graph G is called Cohen-Macaulay if $S/I(G)$ is Cohen-Macaulay. Similarly it is possible to define the edge ideal $I(\mathcal{C})$ of a clutter $\mathcal{C}$.

A relevant class of graphs consists of bipartite graphs. A finite simple graph G is bipartite if there exists a partition of its vertex set $V = V_1 \sqcup V_2$, such that every edge of G is of the form $\{i,j\}$, with $i \in V_1$ and $j \in V_2$. For every $d \geq 2$, d-partite clutters are a natural extension of bipartite graphs. They have been introduced by Stanley in [32]. There are also other possible extensions, see e.g. [2].

In [20], Herzog and Hibi characterized all Cohen-Macaulay bipartite graphs G, showing that a bipartite graph is Cohen-Macaulay if and only if it can be associated to a poset P under a suitable construction. In [7], Ene, Herzog and Mohammadi extended this construction introducing the clutter $\mathcal{C}_{P,d}$, for $d \geq 2$, and describing the maps of the resolution of the Alexander dual ideal $I(\mathcal{C}_{P,d})^*$ of $I(\mathcal{C}_{P,d})$, the so-called *cover ideal*.

By using Betti splitting techniques introduced in [11], in Theorem 3.1 we prove an explicit recursive formula for the graded Betti numbers of $I(\mathcal{C}_{P,d})^*$, extending a result by Francisco, Hà and Van Tuyl [11, Theorem 3.8]. There are several preliminary results to the proof of the main theorem, but we think that Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 3.4 could be results of independent interest. In the case of a poset P with a unique maximal element, the formula can be considerably simplified (see Corollary 3.11). In Corollary 3.12 we give another formulation of [11, Theorem 3.8], on Betti numbers of the cover ideal of a Cohen-Macaulay bipartite graph.

In Example 4.2 we show that Betti splittings could *not exist* for the Alexander dual ideal I_Δ^* of a simplicial complex Δ. Moreover we point out that there is no relation between the existence of a Betti splitting of the Stanley-Reisner ideal I_Δ and the existence of a Betti splitting of the Alexander dual ideal I_Δ^*. Finally we give a sufficient condition that ensures the existence of an x_i-splitting for I_Δ^* (see Proposition 4.4).

Acknowledgements. The last section of this paper was inspired by the summer school *Discrete Morse Theory and Commutative Algebra*, held at the Institut Mittag-Leffler in Stockholm in 2012. The author is

grateful to the staff of the Institut, to the organizers Bruno Benedetti and Alexander Engström, for their suggestions on Discrete Morse Theory and properties of simplicial complexes. Thanks to Paolo Sentinelli for helpful discussions.

2. Preliminaries

Let $\Bbbk$ be a field. Throughout this paper, S denotes the polynomial ring $\Bbbk[x_1, ..., x_n]$. For a monomial ideal $I \subseteq S$, let $\beta_{i,j}(I) = \dim_{\Bbbk} \mathrm{Tor}_i(I, \Bbbk)_j$ be the *graded Betti numbers of* I and $\beta_i(I) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \beta_{i,j}(I)$ be the *i-th total Betti numbers of* I. If I is generated in degree d, we say that I has a *d-linear resolution* provided $\beta_{i,i+j}(I) = 0$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \neq d$. When the context is clear, we simply say that I has a linear resolution.

Denote by $\mathrm{supp}(m)$ the set of variables dividing a monomial m and by $G(I)$ the set of minimal monomial generators of I. If I is a square-free monomial ideal, let I^* be its Alexander dual ideal (see for instance [21]).

The idea of Betti splitting has been introduced in [6], but in this paper we follow the more general setting of [11].

Definition 2.1. ([11, Definition 1.1]) Let I, J and K be monomial ideals such that $I = J + K$ and $G(I)$ be the disjoint union of $G(J)$ and $G(K)$. Then $J + K$ is a *Betti splitting* of I if

$$\beta_{i,j}(I) = \beta_{i,j}(J) + \beta_{i,j}(K) + \beta_{i-1,j}(J \cap K), \text{ for every } i, j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

If this is the case $\beta_i(I) = \beta_i(J) + \beta_i(K) + \beta_{i-1}(J \cap K), \text{ for every } i \in \mathbb{N}$.

In some cases we focus on a special splitting of a monomial ideal I. Let x_i a fixed variable of S. Define $M := \{m \in G(I) : x_i \text{ divides } m\}$, $J := (\frac{m}{x_i} : m \in M)$ and let K be the ideal generated by the remaining monomials of $G(I)$. We call $I = x_i J + K$ an *x_i-partition*. If this is a Betti splitting, we say that $I = x_i J + K$ is an *x_i-splitting* of I.

Francisco, Hà and Van Tuyl, in [11], proved the following splitting results that we use extensively in this paper.

Proposition 2.2. ([11, Corollary 2.4],[11, Corollary 2.7]) *Let I, J and K be monomial ideals in S such that $I = J + K$ and $G(I)$ be the disjoint union of $G(J)$ and $G(K)$. Let x_i be a variable of S. Then*

(i) If J and K have a linear resolution, then $I = J + K$ is a Betti splitting of I.
(ii) If $I = x_i J + K$ is an x_i-partition and J has a linear resolution, then $I = J + K$ is a Betti splitting of I.

Since we are using properties of ideals with linear quotients, we recall here some useful facts. Ideals with linear quotients have been introduced by Herzog and Takayama in [22]. For further details see [21] and [23].

Definition 2.3. Let $I \subseteq S$ be a monomial ideal. We say that the ideal I has *linear quotients* if there exists an order $u_1, ..., u_m$ of the monomials of $G(I)$ such that, for every $2 \leq j \leq k$, the colon ideal $(u_1, ..., u_{j-1}) : u_j$ are generated by a subset of $\{x_1, ..., x_n\}$.

An ideal with linear quotients is componentwise linear (see [23, Corollary 2.8]) and, if generated in a single degree, it has a linear resolution (see [19]).

The following characterization of square-free monomial ideals with linear quotients will be useful later (see for instance [21, Corollary 8.2.4]).

Proposition 2.4. *Let $I \subseteq S$ be a square-free monomial ideal. Then I has linear quotients with respect to the order $u_1, u_2, ..., u_m$ of the monomial generators if and only if for each i and for all $j < i$ there exists a variable $x_h \in \mathrm{supp}(u_j) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(u_i)$ and an integer $k < i$ such that $\mathrm{supp}(u_k) \setminus \mathrm{supp}(u_i) = \{x_h\}$.*

We now recall some definitions about clutters, for further details see [28].

Definition 2.5. A *clutter* $\mathcal{C} = (V(\mathcal{C}), E(\mathcal{C}))$ is a pair where $V(\mathcal{C})$ is a finite set, called *vertex set*, and $E(\mathcal{C})$ is a collection of non-empty subsets of $V(\mathcal{C})$, called *edges*, such that if e_1 and e_2 are distint edges of $\mathcal{C}$, then $e_1 \not\subseteq e_2$. The clutter $\mathcal{C}$ is *d-uniform* if all edges have exactly d vertices. A *vertex cover* of a clutter $\mathcal{C}$ is a

subset $W \subseteq V(\mathcal{C})$ such that $e \cap W \neq \emptyset$, for every $e \in E(\mathcal{C})$. A vertex cover is *minimal* if none of its proper subsets is a vertex cover.

For $d = 2$ this is the definition of simple graph. In literature clutters are also known as *simple hypergraphs*.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a clutter on the vertex set $V(\mathcal{C}) = \{1, ..., n\}$. The *edge ideal* of the $\mathcal{C}$ is defined by

$$I(\mathcal{C}) := \left(\prod_{i \in e} x_i : e \in E(\mathcal{C}) \right) \subseteq S.$$

The edges of a clutter can be seen as the facets of a simplicial complex. Then the edge ideal of a clutter coincides with the facet ideal introduced by Faridi in [10].

The Alexander dual ideal $I(\mathcal{C})^*$ of $I(\mathcal{C})$ is called the *cover ideal* of $\mathcal{C}$. Its minimal monomial generators correspond to the vertex covers of $\mathcal{C}$.

The clutter $\mathcal{C}$ is called *Cohen-Macaulay* if $S/I(\mathcal{C})$ is Cohen-Macaulay.

Example 2.6. Let $V = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. The collection $\{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{3, 4\}\}$ is *not* a clutter. The clutter $\mathcal{C}$ whose edge set is $E(\mathcal{C}) = \{\{1, 2, 3\}, \{3, 4\}\}$ is not uniform. Its edge ideal in $\Bbbk[x_1, ..., x_4]$ is $I(\mathcal{C}) = (x_1x_2x_3, x_3x_4)$. Its cover ideal is $I(\mathcal{C})^* = (x_3, x_1x_4, x_2x_4)$ and in fact the minimal vertex covers of $\mathcal{C}$ are $\{3\}, \{1, 4\}, \{2, 4\}$.

Definition 2.7. Let $\mathcal{C} = (V(\mathcal{C}), E(\mathcal{C}))$ be a d-uniform clutter. We say that $\mathcal{C}$ is *d-partite* if there is a partition $V(\mathcal{C}) = V_1 \sqcup V_2 \sqcup ... \sqcup V_d$ such that all the edges of $\mathcal{C}$ have the form $\{j_1, j_2, ..., j_d\}$, where $j_r \in V_r$, for $1 \leq r \leq d$.

For $d = 2$, this is the definition of bipartite graph.

Let $P = \{p_1, ..., p_n\}$ be a finite *poset*, with partial order $\leq$. We label each element of P in such a way that if $p_i < p_j$, then $i < j$. A subset $C \subseteq P$ is called a *chain* if $C = p_{i_1} < p_{i_2} < \cdots < p_{i_d}$ is a totally ordered set with respect to the induced order. A *multichain* of length d in P is a chain $p_{i_1} \leq p_{i_2} \leq \cdots \leq p_{i_d}$, in which we allow repetitions.

Let

$$\mathrm{Max}(P) := \{p \in P : \text{ there is no } q \in P \text{ such that } p < q\}.$$

By our labeling convention, we have $p_n \in \mathrm{Max}(P)$.

A *poset ideal* α in P is a subset of P with the following property: given $p \in \alpha$ and $q \in P$ such that $q \leq p$, then $q \in \alpha$. We may consider each poset ideal as a subposet of P with respect to the induced order. Notice that, given $p \in \mathrm{Max}(\alpha)$, then $\alpha \setminus \{p\}$ is again a poset ideal of P.

Given $p_1, ..., p_k$ elements of P, denote by $\langle p_1, ..., p_k \rangle$ the smallest poset ideal containing $p_1, ..., p_k$. Let $\mathbb{I}(P)$ be *the set of all poset ideals of P*.

Example 2.8. Let $P = \{p_1, ..., p_6\}$ be the poset with 6 elements, whose Hasse diagram is given in Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. A poset with 6 elements.

Examples of chains in P are $p_1 < p_5$ and $p_1 < p_4 < p_6$. Examples of multichains of length 4 and 5 are $p_2 \leq p_2 \leq p_2 \leq p_2$, $p_1 \leq p_1 \leq p_1 \leq p_6 \leq p_6$. Clearly $\mathrm{Max}(P) = \{p_2, p_5, p_6\}$. The subposet $\{p_1, p_4, p_6, p_2\}$ is a poset ideal of P and it is equal to $\langle p_2, p_6 \rangle$. The subposet $\{p_2, p_3, p_4\}$ is *not* a poset ideal of P, because $p_1 \leq p_2$ but $p_1 \notin \{p_2, p_3, p_4\}$.

Let P be a poset and $d \geq 2$ be an integer. We recall here the construction of the d-partite clutter $\mathcal{C}_{P,d}$.

Let $V = \{x_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ and $T = \Bbbk[x_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq n]$ a polynomial ring on nd variables. The clutter $\mathcal{C}_{P,d}$ is the clutter with vertex set $V = V(\mathcal{C}_{P,d})$ whose edges are

$$E(\mathcal{C}_{P,d}) := \{\{x_{1j_1}, x_{2j_2}, ..., x_{dj_d}\} : p_{j_1} \leq p_{j_2} \leq \cdots \leq p_{j_d} \text{ is a multichain of length } d \text{ in } P\}.$$

Then the edge ideal of $\mathcal{C}_{P,d}$ is

$$I(\mathcal{C}_{P,d}) = \left(\prod_{r=1}^{d} x_{rj_r} : p_{j_1} \leq p_{j_2} \leq \cdots \leq p_{j_d} \text{ is a multichain of length } d \text{ in } P \right) \subseteq T.$$

We give a simple example of this construction.

Example 2.9. Let P be the poset of Example 2.8 and $d = 3$. To avoid double indices, we set $x_j = x_{1j}$, $y_j = x_{2j}$ and $z_j = x_{3j}$. Let $T = \Bbbk[x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3, z_1, z_2, z_3]$. To each multichain $p_i \leq p_j \leq p_k$ of length 3 in P, we associate the monomial $x_i y_j z_k$. For instance, the multichain $p_1 \leq p_2 \leq p_2$ is associated with the monomial $x_1 y_2 z_2$. Then the edge ideal of $\mathcal{C}_{P,3}$ in T is

$$I(\mathcal{C}_{P,3}) = (x_1y_1z_1, x_2y_2z_2, x_3y_3z_3, x_4y_4z_4, x_5y_5z_5, x_6y_6z_6, x_1y_3z_5, x_1y_4z_6, x_1y_1z_2, x_1y_2z_2,$$
$$x_1y_1z_3, x_1y_3z_3, x_1y_1z_5, x_1y_5z_5, x_3y_3z_5, x_3y_5z_5, x_1y_1z_4, x_1y_4z_4, x_1y_1z_6, x_1y_6z_6, x_4y_4z_6, x_4y_6z_6).$$

Let $V_i := \{x_{ij} : 1 \leq j \leq n\}$, for $1 \leq i \leq d$. Then $V(\mathcal{C}_{P,d}) = V_1 \sqcup V_2 \sqcup ... \sqcup V_d$. By construction, $\mathcal{C}_{P,d}$ is d-partite. Note that for $d = 2$ this is the construction of a bipartite graph starting from a poset P, given by Herzog and Hibi (see [21] and [20]). For $d \geq 3$, *not* all Cohen-Macaulay d-uniform d-partite clutters arise from a poset (see e.g. [27, Example 3.4]).

Following [7, Theorem 1.1], we describe explicitly the generators of the ideal $I(\mathcal{C}_{P,d})^*$.

A *poset multideal* of degree d in P is a d-tuple $\underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = (\alpha_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}$, such that

$$\alpha_i \in \mathbb{I}\left(P \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} \alpha_j \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_d = P \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{d-1} \alpha_j \right).$$

Notice that $\bigcup_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_i = P$.

Let $\underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ be a poset multideal of degree d in P. We define the monomial

$$u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}} := \prod_{i=1}^{d} \prod_{p_j \in \alpha_i} x_{ij}.$$

Each monomial $u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}}$ has degree $n = |P|$. Here and in what follows, $|\cdot|$ denotes the cardinality of a finite set. By [7, Theorem 1.1], we have

$$I(\mathcal{C}_{P,d})^* = (u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}})_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in \mathbb{I}_d(P)}.$$

To simplify the notation, from now on we denote by $H_{P,d}$ the ideal $I(\mathcal{C}_{P,d})^*$.

Example 2.10. Let P be the poset of Example 2.8. Examples of poset multideal of degree 3 and 4 in P, respectively, are

$$\underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = (\{p_1, p_3\}, \{p_2, p_5\}, \{p_4, p_6\}) \text{ and } \underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = (\{p_1, p_2, p_4\}, \emptyset, \{p_3, p_6\}, \{p_5\}).$$

Consider the notation of Example 2.9 to avoid double indices, setting $t_j = x_4 j$. We have the monomials $u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}} = x_1x_3y_2y_5z_4z_6$ and $u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}} = x_1x_2x_4z_3z_6t_5$.

In [7, Theorem 2.4], the authors proved that $H_{P,d}$ is a weakly polymatroidal ideal. Weakly polymatroidal ideals have been introduced by Hibi and Kokubo in [14]. From [26, Theorem 1.3], it follows that a weakly polymatroidal ideal has linear quotients. Then the ideal $H_{P,d}$ has linear quotients. In particular it has a linear resolution. Hence $S/I(\mathcal{C}_{P,d})$ is Cohen-Macaulay, by [5, Theorem 3].

3. The recursive formula

Our main result is a recursive formula for the Betti numbers of $H_{P,d}$, extending a recent result due to Francisco, Hà and Van Tuyl, [11, Theorem 3.8]. We recall that the ideal $H_{P,d}$ is generated in a single degree $n = |P|$ and that it has a linear resolution.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $P \neq \emptyset$ be a finite poset, $d \geq 2$ be an integer. Then, for $i \geq 0$,*

$$\beta_i(H_{P,d}) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{I}(P)} \left[\sum_{h=0}^{|\mathrm{Max}(\alpha)|} \binom{|\mathrm{Max}(\alpha)|}{h} \beta_{i-h}(H_{\alpha,d-1}) \right].$$

Before proving the theorem, we explain the situation in some degenerate cases.

Remark 3.2. *(i) If $P = \emptyset$, then $H_{\emptyset,d} = 0$.*

(ii) If $P = \{p_1\}$, then $H_{P,d} = (x_{11}, x_{21}, \ldots, x_{d1})$. It is well-known that this ideal has a linear resolution and its Betti numbers are given by

$$\beta_i(H_{\{p_1\},d}) = \binom{d}{i+1}, \text{ for } i \geq 0.$$

(iii) If $P \neq \emptyset$ is a finite poset and $d = 1$, then $H_{P,1}$ is generated by a single monomial $m = \prod_{j=1}^{n} x_{1j}$. Then $\beta_0(H_{P,1}) = 1$ and $\beta_i(H_{P,1}) = 0$ for each $i \geq 1$.

We now prove some technical results, which will be useful later.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $I \subseteq S = \mathbb{k}[x_1, ..., x_n]$ be a square-free monomial ideal with a d-linear resolution and $\mathfrak{m} = (x_1, ..., x_n)$. Let k be a positive integer and $\mathfrak{n} = (y_1, ..., y_k) \subseteq \mathbb{k}[y_1, ..., y_k]$. Then the ideal $\mathfrak{n}I \subseteq R = \mathbb{k}[x_1, ..., x_n, y_1, ..., y_k]$ has a $(d+1)$-linear resolution and*

$$\beta_i(\mathfrak{n}I) = \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{s+1} \beta_{i-s}(I), \text{ for every } i \geq 0.$$

Proof. We first prove that the ideal $\mathfrak{n}I$ has a $(d+1)$-linear resolution. Notice that $y_1, ..., y_k$ is an IR-regular sequence. By [4, Theorem 2.2], $\mathfrak{n}I$ has a $(d+1)$-linear resolution, since I has a d-linear resolution.

To prove the formula we proceed by induction on k. If $k = 1$, we have nothing to show, since $\beta_i(\mathfrak{n}I) = \beta_i(y_1 I) = \beta_i(I)$, for every $i \geq 0$. Let $k > 1$. One has $\mathfrak{n}I = (y_1, ..., y_{k-1})I + y_k I$. Notice that $G(\mathfrak{n}I)$ is the disjoint union of $G((y_1, ..., y_{k-1})I)$ and $G(y_k I)$. By Proposition 2.2 (ii), this decomposition is a Betti splitting of $\mathfrak{n}I$, because $y_k I$ has a $(d+1)$-linear resolution. Then

$$\beta_i(\mathfrak{n}I) = \beta_i((y_1, ..., y_{k-1})I) + \beta_i(y_k I) + \beta_{i-1}(y_k(y_1, ..., y_{k-1})I), \text{ for every } i \geq 0.$$

Since $\beta_i(y_k I) = \beta_i(I)$ and $\beta_{i-1}(y_k(y_1, ..., y_{k-1})I) = \beta_{i-1}((y_1, ..., y_{k-1})I)$, for every $i \geq 0$, by induction

$$\beta_i(\mathfrak{n}I) = \sum_{s=0}^{k-2} \binom{k-1}{s+1} \beta_{i-s}(I) + \beta_i(I) + \sum_{s=0}^{k-2} \binom{k-1}{s+1} \beta_{i-1-s}(I) = \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{s+1} \beta_{i-s}(I). \quad \square$$

Proposition 3.4. *Let $d, t \geq 1$ be integers. Let $\{I_k\}_{1 \leq k \leq t}$ be an ordered collection of monomial ideals with a d-linear resolution in $S = \mathbb{k}[x_1, ..., x_n]$. Set $I := \sum_{k=1}^{t} I_k$. Assume $G(I)$ is the disjoint union of $\{G(I_k)\}_{1 \leq k \leq t}$ and that:*

(i) for every $2 \leq j \leq t$, the ideal $\sum_{k=1}^{j} I_k$ have a d-linear resolution;

(ii) for every $2 \leq j \leq t$, there exists an ideal $\mathfrak{n}_j$, generated by a subset of the variables $x_1, ..., x_n$, such that $I_j \cap \left(\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} I_k \right) = \mathfrak{n}_j I_j$.

Then

$$\beta_i(I) = \beta_i(I_1) + \sum_{k=2}^{t} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{|G(\mathfrak{n}_k)|} \binom{|G(\mathfrak{n}_k)|}{s} \beta_{i-s}(I_k) \right], \text{ for } i \geq 0.$$

Proof. We may assume $t > 1$, since for $t = 1$ the formula is clear. Consider the following splitting of I:

$$I = \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} I_k + I_t.$$

By our assumption, $G(I)$ is the disjoint union of $G(I_t)$ and $G(\sum_{k=1}^{t-1} I_k)$. Moreover the ideals I_t and $\sum_{k=1}^{t-1} I_k$ have a d-linear resolution by (i), with $j = t-1$. By Proposition 2.2 (i), the splitting above is a Betti splitting of I. By assumption (ii), we have $I_t \cap \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} I_k = \mathfrak{n}_t I_t$. Then

$$\beta_i(I) = \beta_i(I_t) + \beta_i\left(\sum_{k=1}^{t-1} I_k\right) + \beta_{i-1}(\mathfrak{n}_t I_t), \text{ for every } i \geq 0.$$

By Proposition 3.3, we get

$$\beta_i(I) = \beta_i(I_t) + \beta_i\left(\sum_{k=1}^{t-1} I_k\right) + \sum_{h=0}^{|G(\mathfrak{n}_t)|-1} \binom{|G(\mathfrak{n}_t)|}{h+1} \beta_{i-1-h}(I_t), \text{ for every } i \geq 0.$$

We conclude by setting $s = h + 1$ and by induction on t. □

Let $P = \{p_1, ..., p_n\}$ be a poset and recall that, for our labeling convention, $p_n \in \mathrm{Max}(P)$. Let $\psi = \langle p_n \rangle$ the smallest poset ideal of P containing p_n. Define

$$\mathbb{I}(P, p_n) := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{I}(P) : p_n \in \alpha\}.$$

Let $d \geq 2$ be an integer. For every $\alpha \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$, we define the ideal

$$J_\alpha := \left(\prod_{p_i \notin \alpha} x_{di}\right) H_{\alpha, d-1}.$$

In order to define the ideal J_α, we consider α as a subposet of P with respect to the induced order.

Notice that J_α is generated in a single degree $n = |P|$. Since the ideal $H_{\alpha,d-1}$ has a linear resolution, it follows that J_α has a linear resolution. We now give an order of the ideals $\{J_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{I}(P,p_n)}$. Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$, with $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$. We set $\alpha_1 \lhd \alpha_2$ if one of the following conditions is satisfied:

(i) $|\alpha_1| < |\alpha_2|$;
(ii) $|\alpha_1| = |\alpha_2|$ and $\max\{j : p_j \in \alpha_1 \setminus \alpha_2\} < \max\{j : p_j \in \alpha_2 \setminus \alpha_1\}$.

Note that, with respect to the above order, $\psi \trianglelefteq \alpha$, for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$.

Example 3.5. Let P be the poset of Example 2.8. Clearly $p_6 \in \mathrm{Max}(P)$ and $\psi = \langle p_6 \rangle = \{p_1, p_4, p_6\}$. The poset ideals containing p_6 are

$$\mathbb{I}(P, p_n) := \{\{p_1, p_4, p_6\}, \{p_1, p_4, p_6, p_2\}, \{p_1, p_4, p_6, p_3\}, \{p_1, p_4, p_6, p_2, p_3\}, \{p_1, p_4, p_6, p_3, p_5\}, P\}.$$

Consider $\alpha = \{p_1, p_4, p_6, p_2\}$, $d = 3$ and set of P with respect of the induced order:

$$(\emptyset, P), (\{p_1\}, \{p_2, p_4, p_6\}), (\{p_1, p_2\}, \{p_4, p_6\}), (\{p_1, p_4\}, \{p_2, p_6\}),$$
$$(\{p_1, p_2, p_4\}, \{p_6\}), (\{p_1, p_4, p_6\}, \{p_2\}), (P, \emptyset).$$

Then $J_\alpha = z_3 z_5 (y_1y_2y_4y_6, x_1y_2y_4y_6, x_1x_2y_4y_6, x_1x_4y_2y_6, x_1x_2x_4y_6, x_1x_4x_6y_2, x_1x_2x_4x_6)$.

Notice that the given order of the elements of $\mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$ is the order $\lhd$ defined above.

Proposition 3.6. *Let P be a poset, $p_n \in \mathrm{Max}(P)$ and fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$. Then the ideal $J := \sum_{\phi \in \mathbb{I}(P,p_n), \phi \trianglelefteq \alpha} J_\phi$ has linear quotients. In particular J has a linear resolution.*

Proof. Assume $\alpha = \psi$. Then $J = J_\psi$. This ideal has linear quotients, since $H_{\psi,d-1}$ has linear quotients.

We may assume $\alpha \neq \psi$. To prove that J has linear quotients, we use Proposition 2.4. We want to define an ordering $<_J$ of the monomials in $G(J)$. For each $\phi \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$, J_ϕ has linear quotients with respect to an ordering $<_\phi$ of the monomials in $G(J_\phi)$.

Let $u, v \in G(J)$. Then $u \in G(J_{\phi_1})$ and $v \in G(J_{\phi_2})$, for some $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$. We set $u <_J v$ if one of the following conditions is satisfied:

(i) $\phi_1 \neq \phi_2$ and $\phi_1 \lhd \phi_2$;
(ii) $\phi_1 = \phi_2 = \phi$ and $u <_\phi v$.

With respect to the above notation, let $u, v \in G(J)$ such that $u <_J v$.

Assume first $\phi_1 = \phi_2 = \phi$. Since J_ϕ has linear quotients, by Proposition 2.4, there exists a variable $x \in \operatorname{supp}(u) \setminus \operatorname{supp}(v)$ and a monomial $w \in G(J_\phi)$, with $w <_\phi v$ such that $\operatorname{supp}(w) \setminus \operatorname{supp}(v) = \{x\}$. By definition of $<_J$, we have $w <_J v$ and we are done.

Assume now $\phi_1 \neq \phi_2$. We have $\phi_1 \lhd \phi_2$. Then there exist $p_j \in \operatorname{Max}(\phi_2) \setminus \phi_1$. In fact assume, by contradiction, that $\operatorname{Max}(\phi_2) \subseteq \phi_1$. It follows that $\phi_2 \subseteq \phi_1$, since ϕ_1 is a poset ideal of P. This is a contradiction, since $|\phi_1| \leq |\phi_2|$ and $\phi_1 \neq \phi_2$. Then $p_j \neq p_n$, because $p_n \in \phi_1$.

Since $p_j \in \phi_2 \setminus \phi_1$, then $x_{dj} \in \operatorname{supp}(u) \setminus \operatorname{supp}(v)$. By definition of J_{ϕ_2}, there exists a poset multideal $\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = (\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_{d-1})$ of degree $d-1$ in ϕ_2 such that $v = \left(\prod_{p_i \notin \phi_2} x_{di}\right) u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}}$. Since $p_j \in \phi_2$, there exists $1 \leq k \leq d-1$ such that $p_j \in \gamma_k$. Consider the monomial

$$w = \left(\prod_{p_i \in (P \setminus \phi_2) \cup \{p_j\}} x_{di}\right) u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \setminus \{p_j\}},$$

where $\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \setminus \{p_j\} := (\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_k \setminus \{p_j\}, ..., \gamma_{d-1})$. Clearly $\phi_2 \setminus \{p_j\}$ is a poset ideal of P, because $p_j \in \operatorname{Max}(\phi_2)$ and we have $\phi_2 \setminus \{p_j\} \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$, since $\phi_2 \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$. Moreover $\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \setminus \{p_j\}$ is a poset multideal of degree $d-1$ in $\phi_2 \setminus \{p_j\}$. Then $w \in G(J_{\phi_2 \setminus \{p_j\}})$. Since $|\phi_2 \setminus \{p_j\}| < |\phi_2|$, one has $\phi_2 \setminus \{p_j\} \lhd \phi_2$ and $w <_J v$. From the fact that $\operatorname{supp}(w) \setminus \operatorname{supp}(v) = \{x_{dj}\}$, we conclude by Proposition 2.4. □

In the next lemma, we summarize some important properties of the ideals J_α and $H_{\alpha,d}$, for $\alpha \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$. We recall that the intersection $J \cap K$ of two monomial ideals is generated by $\{\operatorname{lcm}(u, v) : u \in G(J), v \in G(K)\}$, where $\operatorname{lcm}(u, v)$ denotes the least common multiple of the monomials u and v. Clearly $\operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{lcm}(u, v)) = \operatorname{supp}(u) \cup \operatorname{supp}(v)$, see [21].

Lemma 3.7. *Let P be a poset, $p_n \in \operatorname{Max}(P)$, $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$, $d \geq 2$ an integer. Then*

(i) $J_\alpha \subseteq H_{P \setminus \{p_n\}, d}$;
(ii) $H_{\alpha,d} \cap H_{\gamma,d} = H_{\alpha \cup \gamma, d}$ and, in particular, $H_{\alpha \cup \gamma, d} \subseteq H_{\alpha,d}$;
(iii) $J_\alpha \cap J_\gamma = \left(\prod_{p_i \in P \setminus (\alpha \cap \gamma)} x_{di}\right) H_{\alpha \cup \gamma, d-1}$.

Proof. First we prove (i). Let $u \in G(J_\alpha)$. By definition there exists a poset multideal $(\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_{d-1})$ of degree $d-1$ in α, such that $u = u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}}$, where $\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = (\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_{d-1}, P \setminus \alpha)$. Since $p_n \in \alpha$, then there exists $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ such that $p_n \in \gamma_i$. Note that $\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \setminus \{p_n\} := (\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_i \setminus \{p_n\}, ..., \gamma_{d-1}, P \setminus \alpha)$ is a poset multideal of degree d in $P \setminus \{p_n\}$, because $p_n \in \operatorname{Max}(P)$. Hence $u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}} = x_{di} u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \setminus \{p_n\}} \in H_{P \setminus \{p_n\}, d}$.

Now we prove (ii). We first show the inclusion from left to right. Let $m \in G(H_{\alpha,d} \cap H_{\gamma,d})$. There exist $\underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = (\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_d)$ and $\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = (\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_d)$ poset multideals of degree d in α and γ, respectively, such that $m = \operatorname{lcm}(u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}}, u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}})$. Define

$$\phi_i := (\alpha_i \cup \gamma_i) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} (\alpha_j \cup \beta_j), \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d-1; \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_d := (\alpha \cup \gamma) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{d-1} \phi_j.$$

We claim that $\underline{\boldsymbol{\phi}} = (\phi_1, ..., \phi_d)$ is a poset multideal of $\alpha \cup \gamma$. Fix $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. Notice that $\phi_i \subseteq (\alpha \cup \gamma) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} \phi_j$, because $\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} \phi_j = \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} (\alpha_j \cup \beta_j)$. If $\phi_i = \emptyset$, we have nothing to prove, then we may assume $\phi_i \neq \emptyset$. Let $p \in \phi_i$ and $q \in (\alpha \cup \gamma) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} \phi_j$, with $q \leq p$. We prove that $q \in \phi_i$. Assume first $p \in \alpha_i \subseteq \alpha \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} \alpha_j$. Since α is a poset ideal of P and $p \in \alpha$, we have $q \in \alpha$. On the other hand, $q \in \alpha \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} \phi_j \subseteq \alpha \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} \alpha_j$ and α_i is a poset ideal of $\alpha \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} \alpha_j$, then $q \in \alpha_i$. Hence $q \in \phi_i$. The proof is the same if $p \in \gamma_i$.

From the fact that $\phi_i \subseteq \alpha_i \cup \gamma_i$, for every $1 \leq i \leq d$, we have that $\operatorname{supp}(u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}}) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(m)$. Then $m \in H_{\alpha \cup \gamma, d}$, since $u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}}$ and m are square-free monomials.

We now prove the reverse inclusion. Let $u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}} \in G(H_{\alpha\cup\gamma,d})$, where $\underline{\boldsymbol{\phi}} = (\phi_1, ..., \phi_d)$ is a poset multideal of degree d in $\alpha \cup \gamma$. Let $\phi_i^\alpha := \phi_i \cap \alpha$ and $\phi_i^\gamma := \phi_i \cap \gamma$, for $1 \leq i \leq d$. Clearly $\phi_i = \phi_i^\alpha \cup \phi_i^\gamma$. We prove that $(\phi_1^\alpha, ..., \phi_d^\alpha)$ is a poset multideal of degree d in α, proving that ϕ_i^α is a poset ideal of $\alpha \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{i-1}(\phi_j^\alpha)$ for every integer $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. Let $p \in \phi_i^\alpha$ and $q \in \alpha \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{i-1}(\phi_j^\alpha)$ such that $q \leq p$. Since in particular $q \in \alpha \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{i-1}(\phi_j)$, then $q \in \phi_i$. Since $q \in \alpha$, then $q \in \phi_i^\alpha$. The proof for γ is the same. Then $u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}} = \operatorname{lcm}(u_{\phi_i^\alpha}, u_{\phi_i^\gamma}) \in H_{\alpha,d} \cap H_{\gamma,d}$.

Eventually we prove (iii). We have

$$J_\alpha \cap J_\gamma = \operatorname{lcm}\left(\left(\prod_{p_i\in P\setminus\alpha} x_{di}\right), \left(\prod_{p_i\in P\setminus\gamma} x_{di}\right)\right) H_{\alpha,d-1} \cap H_{\gamma,d-1}.$$

By part (ii) and since $(P \setminus \alpha) \cup (P \setminus \beta) = P \setminus (\alpha \cap \beta)$, the result follows. □

Proposition 3.8. *Let $P = \{p_1, ..., p_n\}$ be a poset. Then*

$$\beta_i\left(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} J_\alpha\right) = \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{|\operatorname{Max}(\alpha)|-1} \binom{|\operatorname{Max}(\alpha)|-1}{s} \beta_{i-s}(H_{\alpha,d-1})\right], \text{ for every } i \geq 0.$$

Proof. To prove the formula, we use Proposition 3.4. We consider the order $\lhd$ defined above on the ideals $\{J_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)}$.

We recall that the ideals $\{J_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)}$ have a linear resolution and that $G(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} J_\alpha)$ is the disjoint union of $\{G(J_\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)}$. By Proposition 3.6, the ideals $\sum_{\phi\trianglelefteq\alpha} J_\phi$ have a linear resolution, for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$. Then condition (i) of Proposition 3.4 is fulfilled.

We verify now condition (ii) of Proposition 3.4. Fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$, with $\alpha \neq \psi$. We define the following set:

$$R_\alpha := \{\gamma \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n) : \gamma \subseteq \alpha \text{ and } |\gamma| = |\alpha| - 1\}.$$

We claim that

$$J_\alpha \cap \left(\sum_{\phi\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n),\phi\lhd\alpha} J_\phi\right) = J_\alpha \cap \left(\sum_{\gamma\in R_\alpha} J_\gamma\right). \tag{1}$$

The inclusion from right to left is clear, since for every $\gamma \in R_\alpha$, we have $\gamma \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$, $|\gamma| < |\alpha|$ and then $\gamma \lhd \alpha$.

To prove the other inclusion, let $\phi \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$, such that $\phi \lhd \alpha$. Since $|\phi| \leq |\alpha|$ and $\phi \neq \alpha$, then there exists $p_j \in \operatorname{Max}(\alpha) \setminus \phi$ (by the same argument in the proof of Proposition 3.6).

Since $p_n \in \phi$, then $p_j \neq p_n$. Then the poset ideal $\gamma := \alpha \setminus \{p_j\}$ is an element of $\mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$, such that $\gamma \subseteq \alpha$ and $|\gamma| = |\alpha| - 1$, i.e. $\gamma \in R_\alpha$. Notice that $\alpha \cap \phi \subseteq \gamma$, then $P \setminus (\alpha \cap \phi) \supseteq P \setminus \gamma$. From this and from Lemma 3.7 (ii)-(iii), it follows that

$$J_\alpha \cap J_\phi = \left(\prod_{p_i\in P\setminus(\alpha\cap\phi)} x_{di}\right) H_{\alpha\cup\phi,d-1} \subseteq \left(\prod_{p_i\in P\setminus\gamma} x_{di}\right) H_{\alpha,d-1} = J_\alpha \cap J_\gamma.$$

So we proved (1).

For $\alpha \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$ and $\gamma \in R_\alpha$, let p_{j_γ} such that $\gamma = \alpha \setminus \{p_{j_\gamma}\}$. By (1) and Lemma 3.7 (iii) it follows

$$J_\alpha \cap \left(\sum_{\phi\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n),\phi\lhd\alpha} J_\phi\right) = \sum_{\gamma\in R_\alpha} (J_\alpha \cap J_\gamma) = \sum_{\gamma\in R_\alpha} \left(\prod_{p_i\in(P\setminus\alpha)\cup\{p_{j_\gamma}\}} x_{di}\right) H_{\alpha,d-1} = \left(\sum_{\gamma\in R_\alpha} x_{dj_\gamma}\right) J_\alpha.$$

So we proved that condition (ii) in Proposition 3.4 is fulfilled. One has $|R_\alpha| = |\operatorname{Max}(\alpha)|-1$ by construction. Recall that $\beta_i(J_\alpha) = \beta_i(H_{\alpha,d-1})$, for $i \geq 0$. Then by Proposition 3.4, for every $i \geq 0$

$$\beta_i\left(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} J_\alpha\right) = \beta_i(H_{\psi,d-1}) + \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n),\alpha\neq\psi} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{|\operatorname{Max}(\alpha)|-1} \binom{|\operatorname{Max}(\alpha)|-1}{s} \beta_{i-s}(H_{\alpha,d-1})\right].$$

Since the poset ideal ψ is such that $\mathrm{Max}(\psi) = \{p_n\}$, the result follows. □

Now we are able to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We proceed by induction on $n = |P| \geq 1$. For $n = 1$, the formula holds by Remark 3.2.

We may assume $n \geq 2$. We prove that $H_{P,d} = x_{dn}H_{P\setminus\{p_n\},d} + \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} J_\alpha$.

Let $u \in G(H_{P,d})$ and $\underline{\boldsymbol{\phi}} = (\phi_1, ..., \phi_d)$ be a poset multideal of degree d in P such that $u = u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}}$. Assume first $p_n \in \phi_d$, then x_{dn} divides $u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}}$. Notice that $\underline{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \setminus \{p_n\} = (\phi_1, ..., \phi_{d-1}, \phi_d \setminus \{p_n\})$ is a poset multideal of degree d in $P \setminus \{p_n\}$ and $u = x_{dn}u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\setminus\{p_n\}} \in x_{dn}H_{P\setminus\{p_n\},d}$.

Assume $p_n \in \phi_i$, for $1 \leq i < d$. Let $\alpha := \bigcup_{j=1}^{d-1} \phi_j$, then $\alpha \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$. Hence $(\phi_1, ..., \phi_{d-1})$ is a poset multideal of degree $d-1$ in α and $u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\phi}}} \in J_\alpha$.

Conversely, let $u \in G(x_{dn}H_{P\setminus\{p_n\},d})$. Let $\underline{\boldsymbol{\delta}} = (\delta_1, ..., \delta_d)$ be a poset multideal of degree d in $P \setminus \{p_n\}$ such that $u = x_{dn}u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\delta}}}$. Since $(\delta_1, ..., \delta_d \cup \{p_n\})$ is a poset multideal of degree d in P, one has $u \in H_{P,d}$. Let $u \in G(J_\alpha)$, such that $\alpha \in \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$. Let $\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = (\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_{d-1})$ a poset multideal of degree $d-1$ in α such that $u = \left(\prod_{p_i\notin\alpha} x_{di}\right) u_{\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}}$. One has $u \in G(H_{P,d})$ since $(\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_{d-1}, P \setminus \alpha)$ is a poset multideal of degree d in P.

Recall that the ideal $H_{P\setminus\{p_n\},d}$ has a linear resolution. Clearly $G(H_{P,d})$ is the disjoint union of $G(x_{dn}H_{P\setminus\{p_n\},d})$ and $G(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} J_\alpha)$. By Proposition 2.2 (ii), the splitting above is an x_{dn}-splitting. Notice that $x_{dn}H_{P\setminus\{p_n\},d}$ has a linear resolution and $\beta_i(x_{dn}H_{P\setminus\{p_n\},d}) = \beta_i(H_{P\setminus\{p_n\},d})$, for every $i \geq 0$. By Lemma 3.7 (i)

$$x_{dn}H_{P\setminus\{p_n\},d} \cap \left(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} J_\alpha\right) = \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} x_{dn}(H_{P\setminus\{p_n\},d} \cap J_\alpha) = \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} x_{dn}J_\alpha = x_{dn}\left(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} J_\alpha\right).$$

Then

$$\beta_i(H_{P,d}) = \beta_i(H_{P\setminus\{p_n\},d}) + \beta_i\left(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} J_\alpha\right) + \beta_{i-1}\left(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} J_\alpha\right). \tag{2}$$

By Proposition 3.8 one has, for every $i \geq 0$,

$$\beta_i\left(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} J_\alpha\right) + \beta_{i-1}\left(\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} J_\alpha\right) = \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P,p_n)} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{|\mathrm{Max}(\alpha)|} \binom{|\mathrm{Max}(\alpha)|}{s} \beta_{i-s}(H_{\alpha,d-1})\right].$$

Notice that $\mathbb{I}(P) = \mathbb{I}(P \setminus \{p_n\}) \cup \mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$. By induction we conclude. □

Remark 3.9. For $d = 2$, it can be easily proved that this result is equivalent to [11, Theorem 3.8] (see equation (2)).

Remark 3.10. Notice that the Betti numbers $\beta_i(H_{P,d})$ do not depend on the characteristic of the base field $\Bbbk$.

The splitting formula can be simplified if P has a unique maximal element.

Corollary 3.11. *Let P be a poset with a unique maximal element p_n and let $d \geq 2$ be an integer. Then*

$$\beta_i(H_{P,d}) = \beta_i(H_{P\setminus\{p_n\},d}) + \beta_i(H_{P,d-1}) + \beta_{i-1}(H_{P,d-1}), \text{ for each } i \geq 0.$$

Proof. By assumption $P = \langle p_n\rangle$, where p_n is the unique element in $\mathbb{I}(P, p_n)$. The splitting formula follows immediately by equation (2) in the proof of Theorem 3.1. □

Let G be a Cohen-Macaulay bipartite graph. By [20, Theorem 3.4], there exists a poset P such that $\mathcal{C}_{P,2} = G$. By using Theorem 3.1, we are able to give another formulation of [11, Theorem 3.8].

Corollary 3.12. *Let G be a Cohen-Macaulay bipartite graph and P be the poset such that $\mathcal{C}_{P,2} = G$. Then*

$$\beta_i(I(G)^*) = \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{I}(P)} \binom{|\mathrm{Max}(\alpha)|}{i}.$$

Proof. The formula follows immediately by Theorem 3.1 with $d = 2$ and Remark 3.2. □

4. Betti splitting for Cohen-Macaulay simplicial complexes

In this section we present some interesting examples about Betti splittings of Alexander dual ideals of Cohen Macaulay simplicial complexes. By [5, Theorem 3] such ideals have a linear resolution. For more definitions about simplicial complexes, their properties and the Stanley-Reisner correspondence we refer to [21, Chapter 1] and [24, Chapter 3].

Definition 4.1. An *abstract simplicial complex* Δ on n vertices is a collection of subsets of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, called *faces*, such that if $F \in \Delta$, $G \subseteq F$, then $G \in \Delta$.

A *facet* is a maximal face of Δ with respect to the inclusion of sets. Denote by $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ the collection of facets of Δ. A simplicial complex Δ is called *pure* if all its facets have the same cardinality.

The *Alexander dual ideal* I_Δ^* of Δ is defined by

$$I_\Delta^* = (x_{\overline{F}} : F \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta)), \text{ where } \overline{F} := \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus F \text{ and } x_{\overline{F}} = \prod_{i \in \overline{F}} x_i.$$

We briefly recall the definitions of *link* and *deletion* of a vertex i of Δ.

$$link_\Delta(i) := \{F \in \Delta : i \notin F, F \cup \{i\} \in \Delta\}.$$

$$del_\Delta(i) := \{F \in \Delta : i \notin F\}.$$

In the following example we show an ideal with a linear resolution that does not admit *any* Betti splitting. In this example we also point out that the existence of Betti splittings of I_Δ and I_Δ^* are completely unrelated.

Example 4.2. (Dunce hat) Let Δ be the two-dimensional simplicial complex in Figure 2. It is a triangulation of the *dunce hat* introduced by Zeeman [36].




FIGURE 2. A triangulation of the dunce hat.

It is contractible but not collapsible (see [24]). Moreover Δ is Cohen-Macaulay and the graded Betti numbers of I_Δ^* are given by the following linear resolution:

$$0 \to R(-7)^{11} \to R(-6)^{27} \to R(-5)^{17} \to I_\Delta^*.$$

In particular I_Δ^* has 17 minimal generators of degree 5.

Using CoCoA [3] or Macaulay 2 [13], it can be shown that for *every* monomial ideals J, K such that $I_\Delta^* = J + K$, being $G(I_\Delta^*)$ is the disjoint union of $G(J)$ and $G(K)$, the decomposition $I_\Delta^* = J + K$ is *not* a Betti splitting of I_Δ^*. This example answers [11, Question 4.3], showing that, in general, there is no relation between the existence of Betti splitting for a square-free monomial ideal and the characteristic dependence of its graded Betti numbers, since in this case the ideal I_Δ^* has characteristic-independent resolution.

Nevertheless the Stanley-Reisner ideal of Δ admits a Betti splitting $I_\Delta = J + K$, where

$J = (x_2x_6, x_4x_7, x_2x_4x_8, x_3x_4x_5, x_2x_3x_4, x_2x_7x_8, x_3x_4x_6, x_1x_4x_6, x_3x_5x_6)$ and
$K = (x_5x_7, x_5x_8, x_1x_2x_5, x_1x_4x_5, x_1x_6x_8, x_1x_6x_7, x_1x_3x_8, x_1x_4x_8, x_1x_3x_7, x_3x_6x_8, x_1x_2x_3, x_3x_7x_8)$.

In fact the graded Betti numbers of I_Δ are given by

$$0 \to R(-7)^{11} \to R(-6)^{50} \to R(-5)^{86} \to R(-3)^2 \oplus R(-4)^{65} \to R(-2)^4 \oplus R(-3)^{17} \to I_\Delta,$$

and the graded Betti numbers of J, K and $J \cap K$ are given by

$$0 \to R(-6)^3 \to R(-5)^{13} \to R(-4)^{18} \to R(-2)^2 \oplus R(-3)^7 \to J$$

$$0 \to R(-6)^5 \to R(-5)^{19} \to R(-3) \oplus R(-4)^{24} \to R(-2)^2 \oplus R(-3)^{10} \to K$$

$$0 \to R(-7)^{11} \to R(-6)^{42} \to R(-5)^{54} \to R(-3) \oplus R(-4)^{23} \to J \cap K.$$

We finally prove that a condition introduced by Nagel and Römer in [29] ensures the existence of x_i-splitting for the Alexander dual of a Cohen-Macaulay simplicial complex.

Definition 4.3. ([29, Definition 3.1]) A pure non-empty simplicial complex Δ on n vertices is called *weakly vertex decomposable* (WVD) if there exists a vertex v of Δ fulfilling exactly one of the following conditions:

(i) $\mathrm{del}_\Delta(v)$ is WVD and Δ is a cone over $\mathrm{del}_\Delta(v)$ with apex v;
(ii) $\mathrm{link}_\Delta(v)$ is WVD and $\mathrm{del}_\Delta(v)$ is Cohen-Macaulay of the same dimension of Δ.

Notice that Provan and Billera [30] use the same name for a different class of complexes.

Every weakly vertex decomposable simplicial complex is Cohen-Macaulay and every pure vertex decomposable simplicial complex is weakly vertex decomposable, see [29].

Let Δ be a vertex decomposable complex. By [25, Theorem 2.8, Corollary 2.11], the ideal I^*_Δ admits x_i-splitting, for some x_i. Weakly vertex decomposability of Δ is a sufficient condition for the existence of an x_i-splitting of I^*_Δ, for a suitable x_i, generalizing the result cited above.

Proposition 4.4. *Let Δ be a weakly vertex decomposable simplicial complex. Then there exists a vertex $i \in \Delta$ such that I^*_Δ admits x_i-splitting.*

Proof. If Δ is a cone over $\mathrm{del}_\Delta(i)$ for some i, then I^*_Δ and $I^*_{\mathrm{del}_\Delta(i)}$ have the same graded Betti numbers. Then we may assume that Δ is not a cone. Let i be the vertex in the definition of weakly vertex decomposable simplicial complex. Since $\mathrm{del}_\Delta(i)$ is Cohen-Macaulay, then it is pure and i is a shedding vertex (see for instance [25]). By [25, Lemma 2.2], we have $I^*_\Delta = x_i I^*_{\mathrm{del}_\Delta(i)} + I^*_{\mathrm{link}_\Delta(i)}$. Recall again that $\mathrm{del}_\Delta(i)$ is Cohen-Macaulay. Then, by [5, Theorem 3], $I^*_{\mathrm{del}_\Delta(i)}$ has a linear resolution and the result follows by Proposition 2.2 (ii). □

In the following example we show that the converse of the previous proposition does not hold, even in the Cohen-Macaulay case.

Example 4.5. (Hachimori's example) Let Δ be the simplicial complex in Figure 3, due to Hachimori [18]. It is shellable, hence Cohen-Macaulay., but not weakly vertex decomposable. In fact Δ is not a cone and $\mathrm{del}_\Delta(i)$ is not Cohen-Macaulay for $1 \le i \le 7$.

The graded Betti numbers of I^*_Δ are given by

$$0 \to R(-6)^8 \to R(-5)^{20} \to R(-4)^{13} \to I^*_\Delta.$$

The ideal I^*_Δ admits x_4-splitting. In fact $I^*_\Delta = x_4J + K$ is a Betti splitting, where

$$x_4J = (x_3x_4x_5x_7, x_2x_3x_4x_5, x_3x_4x_5x_6, x_1x_2x_3x_4, x_1x_4x_5x_7, x_1x_2x_4x_7, x_1x_4x_6x_7, x_3x_4x_6x_7) \text{ and}$$

$$K = (x_1x_5x_6x_7, x_1x_3x_5x_6, x_1x_2x_3x_6, x_2x_3x_6x_7, x_2x_5x_6x_7).$$

The graded Betti numbers of J, K and $J \cap K$ are given by

$$0 \to R(-6)^4 \to R(-5)^{11} \to R(-4)^8 \to J$$

$$0 \to R(-6) \to R(-5)^5 \to R(-4)^5 \to K$$

$$0 \to R(-6)^3 \to R(-5)^4 \to J \cap K.$$




FIGURE 3. Hachimori's example.

The next definition is important to understand the next example. For further details see [8] and [24].

Definition 4.6. A d-dimensional simplicial complex Δ is called *non evasive* if either

(i) Δ is a simplex or
(ii) $d \geq 1$ and there exists a vertex v of Δ such that $\mathrm{link}_\Delta(v)$ and $\mathrm{del}_\Delta(v)$ are both non evasive.

By [1, Theorem 6.2], every vertex decomposable ball is non evasive. In the next example we present a non evasive ball Δ such that I_Δ^* does not admits x_i-splitting, showing that [25, Theorem 2.8, Corollary 2.11] does not hold for the Alexander dual ideal of a non evasive simplicial complex.

Example 4.7. (Rudin's ball) Let Δ be the *Rudin's ball*, a non-shellable triangulation of the tetrahedron with 14-vertex introduced in [31]. Since Δ is a ball, it is Cohen-Macaulay and I_Δ^* has a 10-linear resolution:

$$0 \to R(-12)^{30} \to R(-11)^{70} \to R(-10)^{41} \to I_\Delta^*.$$

By [1, Theorem 6.3], Δ is non evasive. It is not difficult to show that I_Δ^* does not admit i-splitting, for $1 \leq x_i \leq 14$. Nevertheless $I_\Delta^* = I_{\Delta_1}^* + I_{\Delta_2}^*$ is a Betti splitting of I_Δ^*, where Δ_1 and Δ_2 are given by the following facets:

$\mathcal{F}(\Delta_1)$={{1,3,7,13},{1,3,9,13},{1,5,7,11},{1,5,9,11},{1,7,11,13},{1,9,11,13},{3,4,7,11},
{3,4,7,12},{3,7,11,14},{3,7,12,13},{3,9,12,13},{4,7,11,12},{4,8,11,12},{5,6,9,13},
{5,6,9,14},{5,7,11,14},{5,9,11,14},{5,9,12,13},{6,9,13,14},{6,10,13,14},
{7,11,12,13},{9,11,13,14},{11,12,13,14}};

$\mathcal{F}(\Delta_2)$={{2,4,8,14},{2,4,10,14},{2,6,8,12},{2,6,10,12},{2,8,12,14},{2,10,12,14},{3,6,10,11},
{3,6,10,14},{3,10,11,14},{4,5,8,12},{4,5,8,13},{4,8,13,14},{4,10,13,14},{5,8,12,13},
{6,8,11,12},{6,10,11,12},{8,12,13,14},{10,11,12,14}}.

Both $I_{\Delta_1}^*$ and $I_{\Delta_2}^*$ are computed in $\Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_{14}]$. The minimal graded free resolutions of $I_{\Delta_1}^*$, $I_{\Delta_2}^*$ and $I_{\Delta_1}^* \cap I_{\Delta_2}^*$ are

$$0 \to R(-12)^{13} \to R(-11)^{35} \to R(-10)^{23} \to I_{\Delta_1}^*$$

$$0 \to R(-12)^{10} \to R(-11)^{27} \to R(-10)^{18} \to I_{\Delta_2}^*$$

$$0 \to R(-12)^{7} \to R(-11)^{8} \to I_{\Delta_1}^* \cap I_{\Delta_2}^* \ .$$

REFERENCES

[1] B. Benedetti, F. Lutz, *Knots in collapsible and non-collapsible balls*, Electr. J. Comb. **20**, 3, Research Paper P31, 29 (2013).

[2] M. Caboara, S. Faridi, *Odd-cycle-free complexes and the König property*, Rock. Mount. J.l of Math., **41**, 4 (2011) pp. 1059-1079.
[3] CoCoATeam, *CoCoA 5: a system for doing Computations in Commutative Algebra*, Available at http://cocoa.dima.unige.it.
[4] A. Conca, J. Herzog, *Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity of products of ideals*, Collect. Math. **54**, 2 (2003), pp. 137-152.
[5] J. A. Eagon, V Reiner, *Resolutions of Stanley-Reisner rings and Alexander duality*, J.Pure and Applied Algebra **130**, 3 (1998), pp. 265-275.
[6] S. Eliahou, M. Kervaire, *Minimal resolutions of some monomial ideals*, J. Algebra **129** (1990), pp. 1-25.
[7] V. Ene, J. Herzog, F. Mohammadi, *Monomial ideals and toric rings of Hibi type arising from a finite poset*, European J. Comb. **2**, 3 (2011), pp. 404-421.
[8] A. Engström, *Discrete Morse functions from Fourier transform*, Experimental Mathematics **18** (2009), pp. 45-53.
[9] O. Fernandez-Ramos, P. Gimenez, *Regularity 3 in edge ideals associated to bipartite graphs*, Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics, **39**, 4 (2014), pp. 919-937.
[10] S. Faridi, *The facet ideal of a simplicial complex*, Manuscripta Math. **109** (2002), pp. 159-174.
[11] C. A. Francisco, H. T. Hà, A. Van Tuyl, *Splittings of monomial ideals*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **137** (2009), pp. 3271-3282.
[12] C. A. Francisco, A. Van Tuyl, *Sequentially Cohen-Macaulay edge ideals*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **135** (2007), pp. 2327-2337.
[13] D. R. Grayson, M. E. Stillman, *Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry*, Available at http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/.
[14] M. Kokubo, T. Hibi, *Weakly polymatroidal ideals*, Alg.Colloq. **13** (2006) pp. 711-720.
[15] H. T. Hà, S. Morey, R. H. Villareal, *Cohen-Macaulay admissible clutters*, J. Comm. Algebra **1**, 3 (2009), pp. 463-480.
[16] H. T. Hà, A. Van Tuyl, *Resolutions of square-free monomial ideals via facet ideals: a survey*, Contemporary Mathematics, **448** (2007), pp. 91-117.
[17] H. T. Hà, A. Van Tuyl, *Monomial ideals, edge ideals of hypergraphs, and their graded Betti numbers*, J. Alg. Comb **27**, 2 (2008).
[18] M. Hachimori, *Simplicial Complex Library*, http://infoshako.sk.tsukuba.ac.jp/∼hachi/math/library/index eng.html.
[19] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, *Componentwise linear ideals*, Nagoya Math. J **153** (1999), pp. 141-153 .
[20] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, *Distributive lattices, bipartite graphs and Alexander duality*, J. Algebr. Combinatorics, **22** (2005), pp. 289-302.
[21] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, *Monomials ideals*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer (2011).
[22] J. Herzog, Y. Takayama, *Resolutions by mapping cones*, The Roos Festschrift volume 2, Homology, Homotopy and Applications **4**, 2, part 2 (2002) pp. 277-294.
[23] A. Soleyman Jahan, X. Zheng, *Ideals with linear quotients*, J. Comb. Theory, Series A, **117**, 1 (2010), pp. 104-110.
[24] J. Jonsson, *Simplicial Complexes of Graphs*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1928**, Springer-Verlag (2008).
[25] S. Moradi, F. Khosh-Ahang, *On vertex decomposable simplicial complexes and their Alexander dual*, arXiv:1302.5947v4 (to appear in Math.Scand.) (2013).
[26] F. Mohammadi, S. Moradi, *Weakly polymatroidal ideals ith applications to vertex cover ideals*, Osaka J. Math. **47**, (2010) pp. 627-636.
[27] S. Morey, E. Reyes, R. H. Villareal, *Cohen-Macaulay, shellable und unmixed clutters with a perfect matching of König type*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **212** (2008), pp. 1770-1786.
[28] S. Morey, R. H. Villarreal, *Edge ideals: algebraic and combinatorial properties*, Progress in Comm. Alg. Comb. and Homology **1** (2012), pp. 85-126.
[29] U. Nagel, T. Römer, *Glicci simplicial complexes*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **212**, 10 (2008), pp. 2250-2258.
[30] J. S. Provan, L. J. Billera, *Decompositions of simplicial complexes related to diameters of convex polyhedra*, Math. Operations Research **5** (1980), pp. 576-594.
[31] M. E. Rudin, *An unshellable triangulation of a tetrahedron*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (1958), pp. 90-91.
[32] R. P. Stanley, *Balanced Cohen-Macaulay complexes* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **249** (1979), pp. 139-157.
[33] A. Van Tuyl, R. H. Villarreal, *Shellable graphs and sequentially Cohen-Macaulay bipartite graphs*, J. Comb. Theory, Series A **115**, 5 (2008) pp. 799-814.
[34] R. H. Villarreal, *Cohen-Macaulay graphs*, Manuscripta Math. **66** (1990), pp. 277-293.
[35] R. Woodroofe, *Chordal and sequentially Cohen-Macaulay clutters*, Electr. J. Comb. **18**, 1 (2011).
[36] E. C. Zeeman, *On the dunce hat*, Topology **2** (1963), pp. 341-358.

Davide Bolognini
Dipartimento di Matematica
Università di Genova
Via Dodecaneso 35, 16146 Genova, Italy
e-mail: bolognin@dima.unige.it